

ARGUMENTS/REMARKS

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and this amendment generated in response thereto.

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-9 and 11-18 remain in this application. Claims 2, 6, and 10 have been canceled.

The Examiner objected to claims 2 and 6 as being dependant upon a rejected base claim, but allowable if put into independent format.

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, 11-12, and 14-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Barros (U.S. 6,307,573). Claims 13 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barros in view of Hahensee *et al.* (U.S. 6,067,554). For the following reasons, the rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, as amended, now incorporates the limitation of claim 2, which the Examiner had said would be allowable if combined with the elements of claim 1. Thus, claim 1 is allowable. Similarly, claim 5 incorporates the limitation of claim 6, which the Examiner also stated would be allowable if put into independent format. Thus, claim 5 is allowable for the same reasons. Claims 3-4, which depend on claim 1, and claims 7-8, which depend o claim 5, are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as their parent claims.

Claims 9 and 14 have been amended to recite the step of "listing the corresponding attribute values of text information on the display as alternatives to inline images displayed in the description data". Note that this is similar to the limitations of claims 2 and 6, that the Examiner stated were not taught by the prior art, in that the attribute values are listed as alternatives to inline image display. Thus, claims 9 and 14 are allowable for the same reasons as stated by the Examiner for claims 2 and 6. The remaining claims depend on one of claims 9 and 14, and thus are also allowable.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the

Appl. No. 09/980,73
Amdt. Dated July 18, 2005
Reply to Office action of March 25, 2005

present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 34102.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: 

Robert F. Bodi, Reg. No. 48540

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

July 18, 2005